# PATENT COOPERATION TRACTY

# **PCT**

# Translation INTERNATIONAL PRELIMINARY EXAMINATION REPORT

(PCT Article 36 and Rule 70)

Applicant's or agent's file reference P60081PCT	FOR FURTHER ACTION See Noti	R FURTHER ACTION See Notification of Transmittal of International Preliminary Examination Report (Form PCT/IPEA/416)					
International application No.	International filing date (day/month/year)	Priority date (day/month/year)					
PCT/DE99/01159	15 April 1999 (15.04.99)	20 April 1998 (20.04.98)					
International Patent Classification (IPC) or national classification and IPC C23C 28/02							
Applicant ATOTECH DEUTSCHLAND GMBH							
<ol> <li>This international preliminary examination report has been prepared by this International Preliminary Examining Authority and is transmitted to the applicant according to Article 36.</li> </ol>							
2. This REPORT consists of a total of	5 sheets, including this cover	sheet.					
This report is also accompanied by ANNEXES, i.e., sheets of the description, claims and/or drawings which have been amended and are the basis for this report and/or sheets containing rectifications made before this Authority (see Rule 70.16 and Section 607 of the Administrative Instructions under the PCT).  These annexes consist of a total of sheets.							
This report contains indications relat	ing to the following items:						
I Basis of the report							
II Priority							
III Non-establishment	establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability						
IV Lack of unity of in-	vention						
V Reasoned statemen citations and explan	Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to povelty, inventive step or industrial applicability:						
VI Certain documents	VI Certain documents cited						
VII Certain defects in t	VII Certain defects in the international application						
VIII Certain observation	VIII Certain observations on the international application						
Date of submission of the demand	Date of completion	Date of completion of this report					
29 October 1999 (29.10	0.99) 12	July 2000 (12.07.2000)					
Name and mailing address of the IPEA/EP	Authorized officer	Authorized officer					
Facsimile No.	Telephone No.						

Form PCT/IPEA/409 (cover sheet) (January 1994)

International application No.

### PCT/DE99/01159

I. Basis of the report							
1. This report has been drawn on the basis of (Replacement sheets which have been furnished to the receiving Office in response to an invitation under Article 14 are referred to in this report as "originally filed" and are not annexed to the report since they do not contain amendments.):							
	the international	l application as originally filed.					
$\boxtimes$	the description,	pages1-21	_, as originally filed,				
		pages	_, filed with the demand,				
		pages	, filed with the letter of,				
		pages	, filed with the letter of				
$\bowtie$	the claims,	Nos. 1-11	, as originally filed,				
_		Nos	, as amended under Article 19,				
		Nos.	, filed with the demand,				
		Nos.	, filed with the letter of,				
		Nos.	, filed with the letter of				
	the drawings,	sheets/fig	, as originally filed,				
		sheets/fig	, filed with the demand,				
		sheets/fig	, filed with the letter of,				
		sheets/fig	, filed with the letter of				
2. The amenda	ments have resulte	ed in the cancellation of:					
	the description,	pages					
	the claims,	Nos					
	the drawings,	sheets/fig					
	_						
3. This to go	report has been es beyond the disclo	stablished as if (some of) the ame osure as filed, as indicated in the	endments had not been made, since they have been considered Supplemental Box (Rule 70.2(c)).				
4. Additional of	observations, if ne	ecessary:					
		•					
			·				

ternational application No.
PCT/DE 99/01159

V. Reasoned statement under Article 35(2) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement

1.	Statement			
	Novelty (N)	Claims	1-11	YES
		Claims		NO
	Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
		Claims	1-11	NO
	Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	1-11	YES
		Claims		NO

#### 2. Citations and explanations

This report makes reference to the following document: D1: US-4 990 363

#### PCT Article 33(2)

D1 describes a method for producing adhesive metallic layers on fluoropolymer surfaces.

The first layer is deposited by decomposing organometallic compounds with a glow-discharge method. The second metallic layer is deposited by means of a currentless or galvanic bath (column 2, lines 32-56).

D1 does not mention that the first metallic layer consists of Ni.

Claims 1 to 11 are therefore novel and meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(2).

#### PCT Article 33(3)

According to D1, organo-metallic compounds of the elements in the subgroups 1 and 8 are used, column 3, lines 4-7. The examples use Cu, Pd, Pt and Au. The adhesiveness values can be seen in Tables 1 and 3. These layers are

ternational application No.
PCT/DE 99/01159

#### firmly adhered.

D1 does not mention that the base material surface must be excessively roughened prior to the first metallic layer being deposited, as described in the letter of March 13, 2000.

D1 does not suggest that using Ni should be avoided. The subject matter of Claim 1 of the present application is therefore regarded as a selection from the known prior art.

The applicants have not shown an unexpected effect from using Ni as a first metallic layer. The application does not give any results with adhesiveness values.

Furthermore, Claim 1 is not limited to Ni for the first metallic layer. According to Claim 1, method step a, the first metallic layer contains an undefined amount of Ni. The content of the remainder of the metallic layer is also undefined.

The additional features of independent Claims 10 and 11 appear to be conventional.

Claims 1, 10 and 11 therefore do not meet the requirements of PCT Article 33(3).

Dependent Claims 2 to 9 do not appear to contain any additional features which, in combination with the features of any claim to which they refer, could lead to a subject matter that involves an inventive step. The reasons therefor are as follows:

The features of Claims 3 and 4 are known from D1, column 2, lines 50-51.

Prior to the glow discharge method in D1, the surface is

ernational application No.
PCT/DE 99/01159

treated with a corrosive-gas. According to Example 3, a gas mixture of oxygen and tetrafluormethane is used as the corrosive gas, cf. also Table 2. The features of Claims 6 and 9 are therefore known from D1.

The applicants have not shown an unexpected effect for the features of Claims 2, 5, 7 and 8.

PCT/DE 99/01159

VIII. Certain observations on the international application

The following observations on the clarity of the claims, description, and drawings or on the question whether the claims are fully supported by the description, are made:

According to Claim 7, the average roughness value  $R_a$  is "no higher than 100 nm, preferably no higher than 20  $\mu m^{\prime\prime}$ . Since 20  $\mu m$  is very much higher than 100 nm, this should read 20 nm, as in the description, page 9, line 27.

The use of a method is the method, cf. Claims 10 and 11.